

RACE, ANTI-JEWISH POLEMIC, ARNULF OF SEÉZ, AND THE CONTESTED PAPAL ELECTION OF ANACLET II (A.D. 1130)

Irven M. Resnick

This paper stems from my recently published study that argues that as Christian fears of the European Jewish minority increased in the Middle Ages, Christians mapped a sense of Jewish difference onto the Jew's body.¹ Medieval Christians who, in most instances, never would have encountered a Jew, sought ways to distinguish Jews not merely according to differences in religion, but also through fictive (and perhaps sometimes real) differences in external appearance. In this way, Christians who feared contact with the unknown and unseen Jew could rest assured that "You'll know one when you see one." In addition, the claims of art historians notwithstanding, this effort to map a distinctive Jewish physiognomy or appearance does not first appear in the thirteenth century, but emerges in the first half of the twelfth century along with the partisan propaganda surrounding the contested papal election of A.D. 1130.

What's In a Name?

One might assume that such physical or physiognomic markers would be unnecessary because Jews could be recognized by their names alone. Several studies suggest that at various times and places in the medieval West, however, personal names were insufficient indicators to differentiate Jews from Christians, even though naming was an important ritual in both communities. Jewish male infants typically received a name in association with the ritual of circumcision, while Christian children were named at baptism.² In both cases, one can view the process of naming as attached to a ritual of initiation. At the same time, names are not static

¹ See Irven M. Resnick, *Marks of Distinction: Christian Perceptions of Jews in the High Middle Ages* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2012).

² See Elisheva Baumgarten, "Marking the Flesh: Circumcision, Blood, and Inscribing Identity on the Body in Medieval Jewish Culture," in *Micrologus: Natura, Scienze e Società Medievali. Nature, Sciences and Medieval Societies*, vol. 13: *La Pelle Umana; The Human Skin* (Florence: SISMEL, 2005), 316–18. For the development of a rabbinic liturgical form accompanying circumcision that culminated in the baby's naming, see also Lawrence

identifiers. Just as naming initiates one into an existing religious community, religious conversion demands a *new* name to signify the transition from the old to the new. In the thirteenth-century Dominican Thomas of Cantimpré's collection of *exempla*, the *Miraculorum et exemplorum memorabilium sui temporis* ([A Book] of Miracles or Memorable Tales of his Age), sometimes known under the title *Bonum universale de apibus* (The Common Good [expounded] in Relation to Bees), a young Jewish girl, Rachel, received a vision of the Virgin who addressed her as Catherine, in anticipation of her conversion to Christianity. In another instance Thomas of Cantimpré recalls the conversion of a second Jewish woman, Sara, who became known as Gertrude after her baptism in Cologne.³

Often, Jews who converted to Christianity adopted the name of their sponsor. For example, in 1106 the well-known convert Petrus Alfonsi, who earlier had been known as Moses, assumed the names Petrus because he was baptized on the feast day of Sts. Peter and Paul, and Alfonsi because his godfather was the Emperor Alfonso I.⁴ In 1190 the Jew Benedict of York was forced to adopt the name William, after his sponsor, Prior William of the church of St Mary of York.⁵ One Jewish convert in England, who found residence in the *Domus conversorum* (Converts' Residence) in London in the middle of the thirteenth century, adopted the name Robert Grosseteste, in honor of the famous bishop of Lincoln of that name.⁶ Another convert,

A. Hoffman, *Covenant of Blood: Circumcision and Gender in Rabbinic Judaism* (Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 71.

³ *Miraculorum et exemplorum memorabilium*, bk. 2, c. 29, 21, ed. George Colvenerius (Douai: Bellerus, 1627), 304. For an excellent study of conversion among Jewish women in Germany, see Alfred Haverkamp, "Baptised Jews in German Lands during the Twelfth Century," in *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, eds. Michael A. Signer and John Van Engen, *Notre Dame Conferences in Medieval Studies*, 10 (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 255–310.

⁴ For his own account, see the prologue to Alfonsi's *Dialogus contra Iudeos*, in "Der Dialog des Petrus Alfonsi: seine Überlieferung im Druck und in den Handschriften Textedition," ed. Klaus-Peter Mieth (unpublished doctoral thesis, Freien Universität Berlin, 1982), 1–2. For a translation, see my *Petrus Alfonsi's "Dialogue Against the Jews,"* trans. Irven M. Resnick, *Fathers of the Church, Mediaeval Continuation*, 8 (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2006), 40.

⁵ *The Jews of Angevin England*, ed. and trans. Joseph Jacobs (London: David Nutt, 1893), 105. Benedict was baptised as "William" during the violence of the York massacre in 1190. When after his baptism he identified himself to the king, however, as Benedict the Jew from York, he had evidently rejected his new Christian identity.

⁶ See Michael Adler, *Jews of Medieval England* (London: Jewish Historical Society of England, 1893; reprint Amersham, England: 1984), 290. Adler studies the *Domus conversorum* on 281–339. For further study of this institution that was created by Henry III, see also Robert. C. Stacey, "The Conversion of Jews to Christianity in Thirteenth-Century England," *Speculum* 67.2 (1992), 263–83.

the powerful Henry of Winchester, took his name in honor of his patron, King Henry III (d. 1272).⁷ Similarly, in early fifteenth-century Spain, Bonafós de la Caballería of Saragossa converted and took the name Fernando, after his patron King Fernando I (reigned 1412–1416).⁸

In other cases, the reason behind the selection of a new name may be different or even hidden from us. Herman of Cologne was formerly Judas (or Judah) ben David ha-Levi.⁹ One expects that no Christian convert would wish to be known as Judas. Herman does not tell us how he chose his new name, but only that as he had changed the order of his former life in the laver of baptism, so too he changed his name and adopted the name Herman.¹⁰ Perhaps Herman simply chose a name that was well-known in Cologne. Indeed, many of its archbishops bore the name Herman, most recently Herman III of Cologne (d. 1099). In another instance, at the beginning of the thirteenth century the Oxford Jew Joscepin assumed the name Alberic after his conversion,¹¹ perhaps because at the beginning of the thirteenth century the Earl of Oxford was Alberic II (or Aubrey) de Vere. In late fourteenth-century Spain, Solomon ha-Levi became Paul of Santa Maria. Perhaps this choice simply recalls the transformation of the apostle Paul, who had been Saul of Tarsus prior to his conversion experience (cf. Acts 13. 9). Regardless of the reasons that led to choosing a specific name, conversion signified a transformation that demanded a new name to signify a new religious identity.

Nonetheless, it seems a mistake to assume that Jews changed their names following religious conversion *because* their earlier names were

⁷ Michael Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, 285.

⁸ *The Tortosa Disputation. Regesta of Documents from the Archivo de la Corona de Aragón Fernando I 1412–1416*, Sources for the History of the Jews in Spain, 6, compiled by Gemma Escribà, ed. Yom Tov Assis (Jerusalem: Henk Schussheim Memorial Series, 1998), xxviii.

⁹ Herman of Cologne, whose conversion (if genuine) occurred c. 1128–29, identifies himself as “Herman, formerly known as Judas, of the Israelite race, from the Levitical tribe, from [his] father David and mother Sephora,” (*Hermannus quondam Iudas dictus, genere Israelita, tribu Levita, ex patre David et matre Sephora*). See *Hermannus quondam Iudeus, Opusculum de conversione sua*, 1, ed. G. Niemeyer, MGH, *Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters* (Weimar: H. Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1963), 70; for a translation and a discussion of the problems associated with this text, see Karl F. Morrison, *Conversion and Text: The Cases of Augustine of Hippo, Herman-Judah, and Constantine Tsatsos* (Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 1992), 39–113. For a study of Herman’s identity, see Jean-Claude Schmitt, *The Conversion of Herman the Jew. Autobiography, History, and Fiction in the Twelfth Century*, trans, Alex J. Novikoff (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010).

¹⁰ *Opusculum de conversione sua*, 19, 120.

¹¹ Cecil Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), 11.

clearly identified by other people as “Jewish” names. It may be that the name change reminded the *convert* of the new religious identity and its obligations. For us, the question is not simply whether converts adopted different names—we know that they did—but did the customary names of Jews and Christians identify them to one another as different? The answer will vary across medieval Europe by region and, to some extent, by gender as well. For England, Jacobs provides a lengthy list of names of Jews drawn from the Pipe Rolls in the Records Office. Most of the names for males are clearly biblical, although sometimes the biblical names are given a vernacular equivalent: e.g. Chaim may appear as Vives or Vivard, or Joseph as Josce or Joce. In England Jews also adopted surnames that typically identify them by place of dwelling or origin, or sometimes by a descriptive feature (“the Fat,” “the Tall,” “the Younger,” and so on). In an intriguing digression that may say more about modern than medieval sensibilities, Jacobs adds that *Brun* is the only descriptive first name he uncovered, ‘though one would have thought most Jews of that date were “brun”’!¹²

Jewish women tended far less often to invoke biblical names.¹³ Michael Adler notes that “the large majority of English Jewesses were given purely Norman-French names. This custom was more prevalent in England than in any other country, the men usually being satisfied with Biblical names.”¹⁴ A similar phenomenon may be discovered in France, although not consistently across every region.¹⁵ Simon Seror has compiled an impressive onomastic list for the Jews of medieval France, and attempts to identify as “Jewish” those names that have a Hebrew or Aramaic root, while identifying those with a Greek or vernacular root as “non-Jewish.” Although biblical names predominate for Jewish men in his sample, still “non-Jewish” names were quite common, although more common among the Jews of d’Oc than d’Oil, whereas almost all the Jewish women bear “non-Jewish” names.¹⁶

¹² *The Jews of Angevin England*, 370.

¹³ *The Jews of Angevin England*, 345–70.

¹⁴ Michael Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, 20; Cecil Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, pp. 169–72; cf. Simon Seror, “Les noms des femmes juives en Angleterre au Moyen Age,” *Revue des études juives* 154 (1995), 295–325.

¹⁵ See Richard W. Emery, *The Jews of Perpignan in the Thirteenth Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), 12–14, 200–202.

¹⁶ Simon Seror, *Les noms des Juifs de France au Moyen Âge* (Paris: Editions du centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1989), xiii–xiv.

However, the important question remains: would those outside the Jewish community have been able to identify a Jew simply by his or her name? Bernhard Blumenkranz insists that in medieval France and England this would have been quite difficult, because while Jews—especially Jewish males—often bore Old Testament names, so too did prominent Christians.¹⁷ New Testament names would have been a good indicator of Christian faith, but Old Testament names remained at best an ambiguous marker. Since Jewish females tended more often to adopt Norman-French names, their religious identity would have been even more difficult to establish by virtue of their names alone. Of more importance, as Robert Stacey has shown, is the fact that Norman-French names and language employed by Jews in England would have identified them as “foreigners” and with a sometimes despised ruling class. Indeed, “French was the language of the Jewish hearth and home in post-conquest England and seems to have remained so right up until the expulsion in 1290.”¹⁸ But while linguistic difference might point to differences in ethnicity or class, names employed by Jews in England and France, by and large, were inadequate to differentiate them clearly from their Christian neighbors. By contrast, this was not the case in Toledo, for example, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.¹⁹ Moreover, by 1313 legislation in Castile *required* Jewish men to employ a restricted pool of names, while Jewish women rarely used biblical names and shared many names with Muslim and Christian women.²⁰ As in so many other aspects of Christian-Jewish relations, Spain seems to present different sets of evidence. Nonetheless, fourteenth-century legislative efforts to restrict Jews to a set of names that readily identify them imply that before then confusion and error could occur. Names were often not, then, generally adequate to differentiate Jews from Christians, even in much of Spain.

¹⁷ Bernhard Blumenkranz, *Juifs et chrétiens dans le monde occidental, 430–1096* (Paris: Mouton & Co, 1960), especially 6–10.

¹⁸ Stacey, “Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century England: Some Dynamics of a Changing Relationship,” in *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, eds. Michael A. Signer and John Van Engen, Notre Dame Conferences in Medieval Studies, 10 (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 341.

¹⁹ See Nina Melechen, “Calling Names: the Identification of Jews in Christian Documents from Medieval Toledo,” in *On the Social Origins of Medieval Institutions: Essays in Honor of Joseph F. O’Callaghan*, eds. Donald J. Kagay and Theresa M. Vann (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 21–34.

²⁰ Melechen, “Calling Names: the Identification of Jews in Christian Documents from Medieval Toledo,” 32.

Artificial and Natural Markers

The fear that Jews would be mistaken for Christians was explicitly addressed in Canon 68 from the Fourth Lateran Council (1215), which required Jews to wear on their outer clothing a badge as a clear *artificial* marker, since none existed in nature nor, as we have argued, by convention with any degree of consistency. On the one hand, that the Church felt the need to impose upon Jews an external sign suggests that outwardly Jews and Christians were otherwise indistinguishable. Canon 68 states clearly that "In some provinces a difference in dress distinguishes the Jews or Saracens from Christians, but in certain others such a confusion has grown up that they cannot be distinguished by any difference. Thus it happens at times that through error Christians have relations with the women of Jews or Saracens, and Jews and Saracens with Christian women."²¹ The fear that confusion led to illicit sexual relations provides a motive for imposing a badge as an external signifier. But of greater interest may be the remark that "such a confusion has grown up that they cannot be distinguished by any difference." This confusion was not allayed by the very real physical mark that differentiated Jewish and Muslim males from Christians, namely circumcision. One supposes that circumcision was, for practical purposes, a concealed sign, necessitating the imposition of another on the outer clothing that was evident in public spaces. Moreover, circumcision is a sign only for males, whereas Canon 68 is applied explicitly to both males and females. And, finally, circumcision itself remained an unreliable marker, because it could also mistakenly identify male converts to Christianity as Jews or Muslims.

Yet despite the Council's allusion, on the one hand, to a confusion that stems from an absence of visible difference, on the other hand we do have some evidence from as early as the twelfth century that suggests the opposite, viz. that Christians readily identified Jews (and Muslims) as having a distinctive complexion and physiognomy. Certainly *some* Jews in medieval Europe may have displayed a complexional difference, and as a result the two positions may possibly be reconciled: namely that *all*

²¹ "In nonnullis provinciis a christianis Iudeos seu Saracenos habitus distinguit diversitas sed in quibusdam sic quaedam inolevit confusio ut nulla differentia discernantur. Unde contingit interdum quod per errorem christiani Iudeorum seu Saracenorum et Iudei seu Saraceni christianorum mulieribus commisceantur." Canon 68, Fourth Lateran Council, in *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta*, eds. J. Alberigo, J.A. Dossetti, P.P. Joannou, C. Leonardi, P. Prodi, with H. Jedin, 3rd ed. (Bologna: Istituto per le scienze religiose, 1973), 266.

Jewish males and females (at least those that were beyond puberty) must wear a badge on their outer clothing to avoid “confusion,” while Christians may have been able to identify *some* Jews from natural indicators rooted in complexion or physiognomy. But the evidence we have that Christians attributed a different complexion to Jews does not suggest such a fine distinction, but seems to imply a universal characteristic. This may suggest that because Jews had a different religion and different customs, they had to be *represented* in medieval Christian culture with a different appearance. It seems that medieval iconography and manuscript illuminations from the thirteenth century, in which Jews increasingly would be depicted (or caricatured) with dark skin tones, bulbous eyes, hooked noses, and a malevolent countenance, *construct* a reality that has been shaped more by theological expectations than by empirical observation. This conclusion is largely supported by the work of medieval art historians like Ruth Mellinkoff.²² My goal here, however, is not to revisit the work of medieval art historians who have studied illuminations and manuscript illustrations, but instead to discover from medieval *texts* what we can learn about how some Christians perceived the Jew’s body or outward appearance.

The Contested Papal Election of 1130

The most intriguing early evidence stems from the contested papal election in February 1130 following the death of Pope Honorius II. After the pope’s death, two candidates were elected to the papal throne. One was Gregory, cardinal deacon of St. Angelo, who took the name Innocent II (d. 1143). The other was Peter II Pierleoni, who took the name Anaclet II (d. 1138). Pierleoni had been educated in Paris and took the vows of a Benedictine monk at Cluny before returning to Rome to become, first, cardinal deacon of SS. Cosma and Damiano and, later, cardinal priest of St. Calixtus. Despite the fact that subsequently Anaclet II would be identified as an anti-pope, at the time of his election Peter II Pierleoni had the

²² Ruth Mellinkoff remarks that “From at least the thirteenth century, artists distorted noses, eyes, and mouths to produce Jewish caricatures. Typical distortions associated with Jews—enlarged eyes, hooked noses, enlarged mouths and fleshy lips—became so common that the only differences we see are usually differences of degree.” *Outcasts: Signs of Otherness in Northern European Art of the Late Middle Ages*, 2 vols (Berkeley, L.A., and Oxford: University of California Press, 1993) I, 127–28. In the same way, Mellinkoff adds, medieval artists often depicted Jews with red hair and ruddy skin while, at the same time, frequently assimilating to them the darker complexion of blacks.

support of the majority of the cardinals of the sacred college as well as the support of the Roman clergy and people. His election appears to have been more regular than that of his rival, Pope Innocent II.²³

Since the middle of the eleventh century, contested papal elections had become increasingly common, involving imperial and ecclesiastical politics, Reform ideology, and Roman family rivalries. After the death of Calixtus II (d. 1124), the election of Pope Honorius II was suspect because Honorius was able to ascend the papal throne only after the newly-elected Celestine II had been forced to step down by a campaign of intimidation. When Honorius II died, the disputed election of 1130, however, introduced a new element to papal politics. In a “negative” campaign more familiar to the modern era, several of Innocent II’s supporters attacked Anaclet II (Peter II Pierleoni) as a “Jewish” pope, and whipped up popular animosity.

Pierleoni’s alleged Jewishness was based on the fact that the members of his family were relatively “new” Christians. His Jewish great-grandfather, Baruch (d. 1051), who had married a Christian woman of the house of Frangipani, converted to Christianity c. A.D. 1030 and Latinized his name as Benedictus Christianus.²⁴ His son was named in honor of his baptismal patron, Pope Leo IX (r. 1049–1054). By 1059 Benedict’s son Leo had become one of the most distinguished men of Rome, and in 1061 he was a leading supporter of Pope Alexander II against the anti-Pope Cadalous.²⁵ Although his father had converted to Christianity c. 1030, there is some evidence to suggest that Leo had been circumcised as an infant. In a letter to Emperor Henry IV (r. 1084–1105) from the partisan Bishop Benzo of Alba (d. 1085), Benzo refers dismissively to Leo as *Leo Judaeus*. Benzo, a supporter of the imperial party and of the anti-Pope Cadalous, attacked the enemies of the Church and Empire by invoking Prov. 30.21–22—“By three things the earth is disturbed, and the fourth it cannot bear.” The “fourth it cannot bear” refers to the Normans; the three by which the

²³ Cf. Ferdinand Gregorovius, *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages*, trans. Annie Hamilton, vol. 4.2 (London: Geo. Bell and Sons, 1896), 420. Herbert Bloch describes the election of both Innocent II and Anaclet II as uncanonical, but admits that Anaclet was elected by the majority of electors and by those with greater learning and authority. See his “The Schism of Anacletus II and the Glanfeuil Forgeries of Peter the Deacon of Monte Cassino,” *Traditio* 8 (1952), 162.

²⁴ See H. Dittmann, “Anaklet II, Papst,” in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, 10 vols (Stuttgart: Metzler, [1977]–1999), I, col. 568.

²⁵ Cadalous (d. 1072) assumed the name Honorius II, challenged Pope Alexander II, and was excommunicated in 1063.

earth is disturbed he identified as Leo the Jew, Alexander II ("Anselm [of Lucca] the Pharisee"), and the "cuckoo" Dohech the Idumean.²⁶ Elsewhere Demetrius Zema identifies the "cuckoo" Dohech as Hildebrand, who was later elevated to the papacy as Gregory VII (d. 1085).²⁷ Benzo sometimes nicknames Hildebrand *Folleprandellus*²⁸ or *Prandellus* and he condemns him as a "new little Antichrist" (*novus antichristellus*) that took counsel with Leo, "who had arisen originally from the Jewish community" (*originaliter procedenti de Iudaica congregazione*).²⁹ One possible interpretation is that Leo, a Christian, is tainted by his father's Jewish origins. For several reasons, I think this interpretation fails to reconcile adequately the discordant information. We do not know the date of Leo's birth and although it seems unlikely that Leo could have lived as a Jew with his convert father until he was baptized, nonetheless, if Leo received baptism only between A.D. 1049–1054 during the papacy of Leo IX, and yet Leo was already an important man in Rome in 1059, the conclusion seems inescapable that Leo must have passed his early years as a Jew before his baptism. One problem with this inference is that we know that Baruch/Benedict married a Christian woman, which was perhaps a motive for his conversion. If this Christian woman were Leo's mother, it seems inconceivable that Leo could have been circumcised as an infant. But if this marriage were a second marriage for Baruch, then we can perhaps make some sense of the situation. Leo could have been circumcised as an infant and then gone to live with his convert-father and Christian stepmother. Assuming the existence of a Jewish mother, he would still have been regarded by rabbinic and Church authorities as a member of the Jewish community until his own conversion. In this reconstruction, Leo is in reality one "who had arisen originally from the Jewish community" and not merely a Christian son tainted by his father's prior Jewish identity. According to this interpretation, we can view Leo quite literally as having once been a Jew, *Leo Judaeus*, while Benzo satisfies his polemical purpose too by refusing him the title adopted by Herman of Cologne in the next century that identified Herman as *formerly* (*quondam*) a Jew. If this interpretation is correct, then

²⁶ Benzo of Alba, *Ad Heinricum* 2.4, MGH, *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum Scholarum Separatim Editi*, 65 (Hanover, 1996), 208.

²⁷ Demetrius B. Zema, "The Houses of Tuscany and of Pierleone in the Crisis of Rome in the Eleventh Century," *Traditio* 2 (1944), 172.

²⁸ *Ad Heinricum* 7.2, 582.

²⁹ *Ad Heinricum* 2.4, 204.

his grandson, the future Anaclet II, is drawn one generation closer to his Jewish background.

Leo died sometime before 1072,³⁰ and his position in the family was taken up by his son Peter I, from whom the family derived the name Pierleoni (*Petrus Leonis*—Peter, [son] of Leo). Peter I had no fewer than nine sons, and led the family for another 60 years until his death between 1124–1130. Peter I became a powerful supporter of Pope Gregory VII and the Gregorian Reform movement.³¹ The Pierleoni family remained the chief support in Rome of the Reform party well into the twelfth century, and Peter I Pierleoni's entombment in a rich marble sarcophagus in the cloisters of St. Paul-Outside-the Walls is an indication of the family's importance.

The Frangipani family had helped orchestrate both the election of Pope Honorius II in 1124 and the election of Innocent II in 1130. Peter I Pierleoni's son and Leo's grandson, Peter II, struggled to secure the papal throne as Anaclet II. Precisely because the election of Anaclet II was more regular than that of Innocent II, Innocent's supporters, who were especially numerous in France and included such luminaries as St. Bernard of Clairvaux and the Cluniac abbot Peter the Venerable,³² were driven to wage a “dirty tricks” campaign to discredit Peter's person and character.

³⁰ M. Thumser, “Pierleoni,” in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, 10 vols (Stuttgart: Metzler, [1977]–1999), VI, col. 2136. A.D. 1063 is accepted as the year of Leo's death by both Demetrius B. Zema, “The Houses of Tuscany and of Pierleone in the Crisis of Rome in the Eleventh Century,” 170, and Herbert Bloch, “The Schism of Anacletus II and the Glanfeuil Forgeries of Peter the Deacon of Monte Cassino,” 163.

³¹ Mary Stoll's *The Jewish Pope: Ideology and Politics in the Papal Schism of 1130* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1987) has convincingly overturned the thesis that it was because Anaclet was a representative of the older Gregorian ideology that the cardinals divided their support between him and Innocent II, with the latter viewed as a putative representative of a new religiosity promoted by St. Bernard of Clairvaux. The explanation that relies on opposition between a Gregorian ideology and a new religiosity can be found not only in Stanley Chodorow's “Ecclesiastical Politics and the Ending of the Investiture Contest: the Papal Election of 1119 and the Negotiations of Mouzon,” *Speculum* 46.4 (1971), 613–640, but also earlier in Hayden White, “Pontius of Cluny, the *Curia Romana* and the End of Gregorianism in Rome,” *Church History* 27.3 (1958), 195–219, and Herbert Bloch, “The Schism of Anacletus II and the Glanfeuil Forgeries of Peter the Deacon of Monte Cassino,” *Traditio* 8 (1952), 159–259.

³² Knight has argued that Peter tended to avoid the personal invective that characterized Innocent's supporters' attacks on Anaclet—at least until Anaclet was dead. In *De Miraculis* (composed between A.D. 1135–1142) Peter refers to the schism retrospectively and describes Anaclet, with a pun on his name, as that lion's whelp that raged against the church, the Antichrist and chief of all schismatics (see *De Miraculis* 16, 127, 19–23, in CC CM 83, ed. D. Bouthillier, Turnhout, 1988). See Gillian Knight, “Politics and Pastoral Care:

One of Peter II Pierleoni's most vicious enemies was Manfred, Bishop of Mantua, who, in a letter to King Lothar, was also one of the first to attack the anti-pope's "Jewishness":

Now then how much more do Jewish perfidy and Leonine rabies and Peter's heresy rage against the Church and against an innocent, just, chaste, civilized man, elected and consecrated according to the Catholic rite, Innocent by name, when they struggle with their [supporters] to destroy and to pervert all goods [...] and let him, that iniquitous Peter, the Son of Perdition,³³ with his [supporters], either repent through you or perish through you [...] Who, although he may be a monk, a priest, and a cardinal, does not cease to couple with whores, married women, nuns, his own sister, even those related to him by blood, in every way he could have them, just like a dog.³⁴

Arnulf (d. 1184), archdeacon of Séez and Bishop of Lisieux after 1141, was a second powerful enemy.³⁵ Arnulf's earliest education was at the cathedral school of Séez. It is likely that he continued his education at Chartres, perhaps from 1121–1127. About 1133 Arnulf appears as the clerk of Geoffrey of Lèves, Bishop of Chartres. In Italy, where he had gone to study law, Arnulf composed between 1133–1134 his vitriolic *Invectiva in Girardum*

Papal Schism in some Letters of Peter the Venerable," *Revue Bénédictine* 109, 3–4 (1999), 366–67.

³³ For the Son of Perdition cf. 2 Thess. 2.3. The Son of Perdition was sometimes imagined to be a forerunner to the Antichrist, as John the Baptist was the one who prepared the way for the advent of Jesus.

³⁴ "Nunc igitur quanto magis iudaica perfidia et Leonina rabies et Petri haeresis in ecclesiam furiunt et virum innocentem, iustum, castum, bene morigeratum, catholice electum et consecratum, Innocentium nomine, cum suis perdere et omnia bona moliuntur subvertere [...] et ille iniquus Petrus, perditionis filius, cum suis aut per vos paeniteat aut per vos pereat [...] Qui licet monacus, presbyter, cardinalis esset, scorta, coniugatas, monachas, sororem propriam, etiam consanguineas ad instar canis, quomodo habere potuit, non deficit." Johann Matthias Watterich, *Pontificum Romanorum qui fuerunt inde ab exeunte saeculo IX usque ad finem saeculi XIII vitae ab aequalibus conscriptae, quas ex Archivi pontifici, bibliothecae Vaticanae aliarumque codicibus adiectis suis cuique et annalibus et documentis gravioribus*. Vol. 2: *Paschalis II-Celestinus III (1099–1198)* (Leipzig: 1862), n. 1, 275–76.

³⁵ For Arnulf's biography and career see Carolyn Poling Schriber, *The Dilemma of Arnulf of Lisieux: New Ideas versus Old Ideals* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990). Arnulf's extensive letter collection offers a good window onto politics at the middle of the twelfth century. For the Latin text, see Frank Barlow, *The Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux*, Camden Third Series, vol. 61 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1939). More recently, Carolyn Poling Schriber has translated Arnulf's letters (and suggested a different arrangement for the collection) in *The Letter Collections of Arnulf of Lisieux*, trans. Carolyn Poling Schriber, Texts and Studies in Religion, vol. 72 (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1997).

Engolismensem episcopum,³⁶ in support of the papal claim of Innocent II. Arnulf dedicated this to his patron, Geoffrey of Lèves, who was himself engaged in the conflict and opposed Gerard, Bishop of Angoulême, who supported Anaclet II. The invective gained the attention of St. Bernard and Peter the Venerable, who later favored Arnulf's efforts to obtain higher office. Sometime before 1139—the date is uncertain—it seems that Arnulf continued his studies in Paris, where he developed a friendly relationship with the Augustinian monastery of St. Victor, to which he retired at the end of his long life. By 1139 he had finished his schooling and came to serve Stephen of Blois (d. 1154), who sought from the papacy recognition as King of England and Duke of Normandy. Arnulf represented him successfully before Innocent II as an ambassador at the Lateran council of 1139.³⁷ After his uncle John died in 1141, Arnulf was elected bishop of Lisieux.

In his invective against the Bishop Gerard of Angoulême, Arnulf reiterated many of the same complaints listed above by Manfred of Mantua and expanded on Anaclet's alleged incestuous relations with his sister, Tropea:

It is reported—but it is too wicked to say—that he defiled his sister Tropea in bestial incest, and that in an abominable portent they bore sons from her, [and] he who was a father to his nephews became an uncle to his sons, and thus so confused the law of nature that he made them related and brothers to one another as well as to him. No longer merely a Jew but worse than a Jew!³⁸

Arnulf attributes Anaclet's perfidy and error to his family's avarice and its struggle to achieve wealth and standing in Rome, which he treats as enduring Jewish characteristics that can hardly be expunged. Arnulf claims that the Pierleoni family had long groomed Peter II for high ecclesi-

³⁶ Arnulf's *Invectiva in Girardum Engolismensem episcopum* is found in MGH, *Libelli de lite*, vol. 3, ed. J. Dieterich (Hanover: Hahn, 1897), 85–107, and in MGH, *SS*, vol. 12 (Hanover: Hahn, 1856; Kraus Reprint, 1963).

³⁷ Arnulf's advocacy on behalf of Stephen of Blois was marked by the same sort of poisonous invective directed against Matilda, daughter of Henry I, as he had employed earlier against Anaclet. Arnulf dismissed her mother as a nun that her father had violated and characterized Matilda as the product of an incestuous union. See *John of Salisbury's Mémoires of the Papal Court*, ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall (London: Nelson, 1956; repr. 1962, 1965), 83–85; cf. Mary Stroll, *The Jewish Pope*, 129–30.

³⁸ “Sororem Tropeam—sed nec dici fas est—bestiali polluisse narratur incestu et ex ea abominabili prodigo eosdem sustulisse filios, quos nepotes, nepotum pater, filiorum factus avunculus, sic naturae iura confudit, ut eosdem sibi invicem fratres faceret et cognatos. Iam nec Iudeus quidem, sed etiam Iudeo deterior!” *Invectiva in Girardum Engolismensem episcopum*, 3, 95.

astical office. Peter's education in France was intended to make him more acceptable to the powerful French church, with a view toward ultimately obtaining the apostolic see.³⁹ With the monastic habit that he received at Cluny, Peter II concealed his true nature, like a wolf in sheep's clothing.⁴⁰ His wicked habits, Arnulf insists, were hidden so well that he was later raised to the rank of cardinal. But his true character was revealed when, as a papal legate, he enriched himself through illicit exactions that despoiled churches and monasteries. His gluttony satisfied itself in twice-daily banquets procured at monumental expense.⁴¹ Arnulf proclaims that it is this abundant rich food that stirred Peter's aberrant sexual desires, leading him to violate his own sister. Even worse, Arnulf remarks, Peter brought out for public display a young girl with a monk's tonsure and clothed in a monk's habit, who accommodated various sexual acts and "displayed the face of a man but in the rest of the body displayed the parts of a woman."⁴² Peter was himself said to have participated in nightly sexual congress with this apparent hermaphrodite, who enabled him to enjoy the pleasures of both sexes, lest he become too easily bored. His gluttony and sexual misdeeds, Arnulf remarks, clearly demonstrate that Peter failed to follow the example of Christ, who would have us restrain the demands of the flesh. As a result, his character rendered him unfit to assume the papal throne. Invoking the language of St. Paul from 2 Cor. 6.15, Arnulf cries out: "There is no concord between Christ and Belial, no connection between light and darkness."⁴³

The biblical Belial was often invoked by early medieval Christian writers to refer specifically to Jews, Muslims, or Christian heretics.⁴⁴ In the second

³⁹ "Porro ipsum a cunabulis, ab ipsius nutricis uberibus apostolatui presaga parentum destinavit ambitio atque post prima litterarum rudimenta docendum delegavit in Galliam, ut illius regni benevolentiam ipsi morum linguaeque conformatio vendicaret." *Invectiva in Girardum Engolismensem episcopum*, 3, 93.

⁴⁰ "Post haec habitum quoque monachatus excepit, ut vitia mentis ovino velaret amictu." *Invectiva in Girardum Engolismensem episcopum*, 3, 93.

⁴¹ *Invectiva in Girardum Engolismensem episcopum*, 3, 95.

⁴² "circumducebatur puella, cui in fraudem videntium adolescentis speciem vestis et tonsura conferret, quae singulos estus toleraret, singulos solaretur affectus, eo gratior et quasi quodam novitatis affectata miraculo, quod dum virum facie, reliquis mulierem partibus exhibet, uterque sexus ipsi in eodem corpore videbatur exponi." *Invectiva in Girardum Engolismensem episcopum*, 3, 95.

⁴³ "Nulla enim conventio Christi ad Belial, nulla lucis ad tenebras communicatio." *Invectiva in Girardum Engolismensem episcopum*, 3, 96.

⁴⁴ In the Hebrew Bible, Belial characterizes people who lie, deceive, conspire, or behave in a dissolute fashion. In the pseudepigrapha, however, Belial designates the Prince of Evil or Satan. See "Belial," *Encyclopedia Judaica* vol. 4, 427–28. For Belial as a designation for

half of the eleventh century Belial was also frequently invoked in a general way by the monastic reformer and Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, St. Peter Damian, to condemn simoniacs and dissolute monks (much as later Anaclet II would himself condemn some of his former monastic brethren at Cluny as Belial and Sons of Hagar, for failing to support his claim to the papal throne).⁴⁵ Damian also attacked bishops who gave themselves over to the pleasures of the flesh, reminding them that as a result of their dissolute sexual habits they follow not Christ but Antichrist, and that just as light cannot consort with darkness, so too neither can Christ associate with Belial.⁴⁶ But more specifically Damian employed this text against the anti-Pope Cadalous in a propaganda campaign only slightly less noxious than Arnulf's campaign against Anaclet II. Moreover, Damian often linked Paul's contention in 2 Cor. 6.15 that "There is no concord between Christ and Belial" with 2 Thess. 2.3–4, which speaks of the "Son of Perdition" and "Man of Sin" that raises himself up in the temple of God, and as a result Damian identified Cadalous both with Belial and with the "Son of Perdition," the forerunner or minion of Antichrist.⁴⁷

Just as Damian condemned the anti-Pope Cadalous as Belial and Antichrist, so too does Arnulf of Seéz condemn the anti-Pope Anaclet II. Prior to his elevation to the papal throne, his dissolute and unnatural sexual proclivities mark him as "Belial," an enemy of Christ, and identify him with Antichrist. Above, Manfred of Mantua had already identified Peter II Pierleoni as the "Son of Perdition" while commenting that Peter "does not cease to couple with whores, married women, nuns, his own sister, even those related to him by blood, in every way he could have them, just like a dog." Arnulf insists that all the world, except the supporters whose loyalty he purchased, recognized Anaclet to be the Antichrist. Thus, in addition to the usual complaint of simony—that is, that the Pierleoni bought the outcome of the papal election—Arnulf insists that a Pierleoni plot to obtain the papal throne for Anaclet II reflects a Jewish ambition for world domination and "increased the faith, that arose among the Jews, that dominion over the entire world began with possession of

Muslims, see Scott G. Bruce, "An Abbot Between Two Cultures: Maiolus of Cluny Considers the Muslims of La Garde-Freinet," *Early Medieval Europe* 15.4 (2007), 429–32.

⁴⁵ See Anaclet's letter to Cluny at PL 179: 695.

⁴⁶ Damian, *Epistola* 61.11, in *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, ed. Kurt Reindel, MGH, *Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, 4 vols. (Munich, 1983–1993), II, 214.

⁴⁷ See his *Epistolae* 99.4 and 120.13, in *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, III, 99, 390.

the Roman see.”⁴⁸ In him, Arnulf adds, the power and prestige of the Roman church have collapsed. He is the Son of Perdition, the Man of Sin, the perfidious adversary of the human race,⁴⁹ and either as the Antichrist himself or as the one that prepares the way for Antichrist,⁵⁰ Anaclet has usurped the papal throne to lead the children of the New Israel astray.

The essential difference between Damian’s campaign against Cadalous and Arnulf’s campaign against Anaclet II, however, is the latter’s injection of an anti-Jewish polemic. In itself, this might appear easily explicable. Given that the Pierleoni had converted to Christianity in recent memory, Arnulf may simply have added anti-Jewish sentiment as an effective tool from his polemical arsenal. But this in itself does not explain the specific form this polemic assumed. For not only did Arnulf attack Anaclet II for displaying Jewish flaws in the realm of religious belief and morality, he also attributed to Anaclet II denigrating physical or racial characteristics that he identified as somehow “Jewish.”⁵¹ It is not only his immoral and wicked habits, Arnulf insists, that disqualify Anaclet II as a true pope. Equally important is the fact that his was a family of new Christians still rooted in the material of its Jewish soil, enriched by usury, “conspiring with the enemy of the human race” to corrupt the purity of the Roman people. Despite the fact that approximately eighty years had passed since the baptism of his grandfather, Leo, Peter II Pierleoni is said to display a Jewish appearance. Thus, somewhat disingenuously Arnulf adds:

And so it is pleasing to pass over the ancient origin of his birth and [his] similarly ignoble race, and I do not think that the Jewish name from which he himself drew not only material for the flesh but even certain first fruits of native error ought to be set before us. He is himself sufficient and copious material and I do not think that there is or has been anyone worse than him in his household. Although his grandfather collected inestimable wealth from multiple usurious transactions, he condemned the circumcision that

⁴⁸ “Augebat fidem, quod ex Iudeis ortus, quod totius mundi dominium Romanae sedis auspicabatur obtentu.” *Invectiva in Girardum Engolismensem episcopum*, 3, 93.

⁴⁹ “ille humani generis perfidus adversator.” *Invectiva in Girardum Engolismensem episcopum*, 4, 97.

⁵⁰ “homo peccati, perditionis filius, revelatur [...] quoniam vel ipse antichristus est, vel in ipso nobis antichristi tempora preparantur.” *Invectiva in Girardum Engolismensem episcopum*, 4, p. 98. Cf. *Invectiva in Girardum Engolismensem episcopum*, 7, 103, where Arnulf claims Anaclet is more properly named Antichrist: “Petrum scilicet Leonis Anacleti nomine (sed verius antichristi!) papam esse.”

⁵¹ Cf. Aryeh Graboïs, “Le Schisme de 1130 et la France,” *Revue de histoire ecclésiastique* 76 (1981), 593–612. Graboïs suggests that this propaganda injected an early form of racial antisemitism to medieval polemics.

he had received with the water of baptism. He was ashamed of his powerlessness rather than of his error, lest perpetual darkness condemn his race that is confounded by the opprobrium of infidelity. Therefore, once he had received the sacraments of the faith, he was grafted on as a new citizen of the city [and] made a Roman in dignity. Since the queen bestows race and form for money, and since a series of good issues bestowed upon him numerous progeny, he tied to himself all the nobles of the city by marriage, one after another, already conspiring with the enemy of the human race, so that as if by an old yeast the entire dough of Roman purity would be corrupted.⁵² From this mixture of various races, then, Gerard, there arose this Peter of yours, who displays a Jewish image on [his] face and repays perfidy for a sacred promise and goodwill.⁵³

Later Arnulf depicts Gerard as an owl (*bubo*) that is blinded by the light of day, whose obstinate heart will not permit him to hear the truth, namely that “that faithless company you follow is the Pierleoni family that is not yet cleansed inwardly of the yeast of Jewish corruption.”⁵⁴ Arnulf’s metaphor is well-chosen. According to the twelfth-century *Book of Beasts* “Owls are symbolical to the Jews, who repulse our Saviour when he comes to redeem them [... (because)] They value darkness more than light.”⁵⁵

⁵² Cf. 1 Cor. 5.6–7.

⁵³ “Libet igitur preterire antiquam nativitatis originem et ignobilem similem prosapiam, nec Iudaicum nomen arbitror opponendum, de quibus ipse non solum materiam carnis, sed etiam quasdam primitias ingeniti contraxit erroris. Ipse enim sufficiens est et copiosa materia, neque quicquam domui eius ipso turpius vel esse vel fuisse coniecto. Cuius avus, cum inestimabilem pecuniam multipli corrogasset usura, susceptam circumcisionem baptismatis unda dampnavit. Pudebat eum impotentiae suae potius quam erroris, ne genus eius infidelitatis opprobrio confusum perpetua dampnaret obscuritas. Susceptis itaque fidei sacramentis, urbi novus civis insitus est factus dignitate Romanus. Cumque ipsi numerosam progeniem series successionis afferet, dum genus et formam regina pecunia donat, alternis matrimoniis omnes sibi nobiles civitatis ascivit, machinante iam humani generis hostile, ut quasi quodam veteri fermento tota Romanae sinceritatis conspersio corrumperetur. Ex hac itaque diversorum generum mixtura, Girarde, Petrus iste tuus exortus est, qui et Iudaicam facie representet imaginem et perfidiam voto referat et affectu.” *Invectiva in Girardum Engolismensem episcopum*, 3, 92–93. Leo was Petrus II Pierleoni’s grandfather. The identity of the “queen” who bestowed Roman dignities for money remains uncertain. Perhaps Agnes is meant, wife of Emperor Henry III, who was crowned in Rome at Christmas, A.D. 1046. After Henry’s death, from 1056–62 Agnes was regent for the young Henry IV.

⁵⁴ “Infidelis universitas illa, quam sequeris, familia Petri Leonis est, nondum fermento iudaicae corruptionis penitus expiata.” *Invectiva in Girardum Engolismensem episcopum*, 8, 107.

⁵⁵ *The Book of Beasts, Being a Translation from a Latin Bestiary of the Twelfth Century*, ed. T.H. White (New York: Dover Publications, 1984), 134; cf. *Physiologus*, trans. Michael J. Curley (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1979), 11.

In ecclesiastical art or ornaments the owl often symbolized the Jews.⁵⁶ In the same way, Jews were frequently condemned for a stubborn or obstinate heart that would not permit them to acknowledge Jesus as the Christ. The implication seems to be that simply by following one “not yet cleansed inwardly of the yeast of Jewish corruption” Gerard has been infected by the Jews’ blindness and obduracy.

Arnulf also casts doubt upon the sincerity of the Christian faith of Leo, Anaclet’s grandfather, and suggests that it was to obtain worldly standing that Leo converted from Judaism, because “he was ashamed of his powerlessness rather than of his error.” His grandson, Peter II, now Anaclet II, is the product of a marriage arranged with the old Roman nobility, but rather than “naturalizing” Peter as a Christian, instead he is a mixture of races, and “by an old yeast the entire dough of Roman purity” is corrupted. And, lest anyone miss the point, in a letter to King Lothar of Germany (d. 1137), Holy Roman Emperor after 1133, the cardinal bishops who supported Innocent II and opposed Anaclet II pointed out that Anaclet had assumed the papal insignia at that very sixth hour when the Jews had crucified Christ.⁵⁷ Such behavior suggested that Anaclet II is himself the Antichrist, and medieval tradition had coalesced to indicate that Antichrist will be a hidden or concealed Jew, a crypto-Jew, one who lacks the physical mark of circumcision by which Jews differentiate themselves. So too Arnulf alleged that Anaclet II is a concealed Jew, although one whose Jewishness is visible on his face for those who know how to recognize it. He comes from that very race from which Antichrist will arise and, drawing upon the perfidy of his Jewish origins, he conspires with the aid of his grandfather’s wealth first to obtain the Roman See and then to rule the entire world. It is almost certainly Arnulf’s description that led the late nineteenth-century Church historian, Philip Schaff, to remark that “Anacletus betrayed his Semitic origin in his physiognomy, and was inferior to Innocent in moral character.”⁵⁸

⁵⁶ See Mariko Miyazaki, “Misericord Owls and Medieval Anti-semitism,” in *The Mark of the Beast: The Medieval Bestiary in Art, Life, and Literature*, ed. Debra Hassig (New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1999), 23–50.

⁵⁷ “Petrus Leonis hora sexta, qua Iudaea Christum crucifixit et tenebrarum caligo mundum involvit, cum suis conspiratoribus atque consanguineis aliisque manifesto pretio conductis ecclesiam sancti Martii (l. Marci), turribus fratrum propinquam, festinanter adiit, cappam rubeam indecenter induit fictitiaeque Pontificatus insignia arripuit.” Watterich, *Pontificum Romanorum* II, 182.

⁵⁸ Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, 4.25 (Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 1997), 217.

Even St. Bernard of Clairvaux became involved in the negative campaign against Anaclet II. In a letter to King Lothar Bernard also insisted that “it is an insult to Christ that the offspring of a Jew has occupied the chair of Peter.”⁵⁹ In addition, Bernard condemned Anaclet by comparing him to the lion of the Apocalypse,⁶⁰ perhaps to recall “the lion of the tribe of Judah” (Rev. 5.5). It is remarkable that Anaclet’s Jewish origins—indeed, not his own, but his grandfather’s—aroused no antipathy while a monk at Cluny or later as a cardinal, but once he was elevated to the papacy it became the basis for a series of attacks. Of interest to us, however, is Arnulf’s claim that Anaclet II “displays a Jewish image on [his] face.” What can this mean, if not that already during the first half of the twelfth century the notion that Jews had distinctive features or complexion could be invoked without requiring further explanation?

We also have one other piece of evidence from this same controversy. At the Council of Rheims in 1119, at which Pope Callixtus II excommunicated Emperor Henry V, Anaclet’s brother Gratian, who had been a hostage during negotiations, was released to Calixtus II. According to the contemporary historian Orderic Vitalis (d. c. 1142), at the council,

The Archbishop of Cologne [...] also freely surrendered a son of Peter Leonis, whom he held as a hostage. Announcing this as if it were a great triumph and exceptional pleasure, the envoy pointed out with his finger a dark-haired, pale youth, *more like a Jew or a Saracen than a Christian*, dressed in splendid garments, but physically deformed. At the sight of him seated beside the Pope the French and many others laughed scornfully, and called down shame and swift destruction on his head, out of hatred for his father whom they knew as an infamous usurer.⁶¹

⁵⁹ “constat Judaicam sobolem sedem Petri in Christi occupasse injuriam.” *Sancti Bernardi Opera genuina*, Epist. 139.1, ed. Monks of St. Benedict, 8 vols (Lyons and Paris: Perisse Frères, 1854), I, 125.

⁶⁰ Bernard of Clairvaux, Epist. 125, no.1, PL 182: 270A–B.

⁶¹ “Coloniensis archiepiscopus [...] filium quoque Petri Leonis, quem obsidem habebat ob amoris specimen gratis reddidit. Haec dicens, quasi ob insigne tripudium laetiamque mirabilem, digito monstravit nigrum et pallidum adolescentem, magis Judaeo vel Agareno quam christiano similem, vestibus quidem optimis indutum, sed corpore deformen. Quem Franci, aliique plures papae adistentem intuentes, deriserunt, eique dedecus perniciemque citam imprecati sunt, propter odium patris ipsius quem nequissimum foeneratorum nouerunt.” *The Ecclesiastical History of Oderic Vitalis*, 12.21, ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall, 6 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1978), VI, 66–68. The italics are mine. Note that Yerushalmi cites this passage incorrectly as a reference to Peter II Pierleoni rather than Gratian. See Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, “Assimilation and Racial Anti-Semitism: the Iberian and the German Models,” *Leo Baeck Memorial Lecture*, 26 (1982), 6.

Marjorie Chibnall's elegant translation obscures one point: the Latin text does not describe Gratian as "a dark-haired, pale youth" but rather simply as a youth that is dark—or even black—and pallid (*nigrum et pallidum adolescentem*). Chibnall's translation fits better a passage from a late thirteenth-century text falsely attributed to Albertus Magnus, which remarks that "with respect to their innate complexion, offspring are accustomed to be like their parents, and vice versa. But we see that in many cases the race of Jews has black hair."⁶² While a pale complexion may often produce dark or black hair, the passage in Orderic Vitalis seems more likely to refer to skin tone or complexion. More than a century later, Matthew Paris also evoked a contrast between the bearded, dark-skinned Saracen and the French.⁶³ Similarly, in illuminations accompanying William of Tyre's famous Crusader chronicle, the *History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, "Muslims are most frequently represented with black skin and black faces."⁶⁴ I suspect that Chibnall supplied *dark-haired* in order to avoid the seeming contradiction between dark and pallid, although no such contradiction existed for medieval humoral theory.⁶⁵

In sum, in this highly charged polemical atmosphere, Anaclet II was charged with displaying "a Jewish image on [his] face"; Gratian was denigrated for having a dark complexion, "more like a Jew or a Saracen than a Christian"; and the entire Pierleoni family was derided for not having "been completely cleansed of the Jewish yeast of corruption." In part, the Jewish traits that marked these "new" Christians were vices: avarice, ambition, and a lust for power. But in part and despite (or because of) their persistent support for the Reform party, they were also identified

⁶² "Secundum complexionem innatam soboles solent assimilari parentibus, et e contra; sed videmus, quod genus Judaeorum ut in pluribus habet nigros capillos." Ps. Albertus Magnus, *Quaestiones super Evangelium*, q. 19.2.5. The text is found in Albertus Magnus, *Opera omnia*, ed. Auguste Borgnet, 38 vols. (Paris: L. Vivès, 1890–99) XXXVII, 1–362. For a discussion of this text and its treatment of physiognomy, see my "Ps. Albert the Great on the Physiognomy of Jesus and Mary," *Medieval Studies* 64 (2002), 217–240.

⁶³ See *The Illustrated Chronicles of Matthew Paris: Observations of Thirteenth-Century Life*, ed. and trans. Richard Vaughn (Phoenix Mill, UK: Alan Sutton Publishing, 1993), 176. Muslim chroniclers, similarly, remarked upon the fact that the pale-skinned Franks shaved their beards. See the account of al-Qazwini (d. 1283) in Carole Hillenbrand, *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 272.

⁶⁴ Svetlana Luchitskaya, "Muslims in Christian Imagery of the Thirteenth Century: The Visual Code of Otherness," *Al-Masāq* 12 (2000), 46.

⁶⁵ That is, pallor indicated a lack of natural heat in complexion, whereas blackness could stem from a predominance of melancholy or black bile. In fact a melancholy complexion is itself a cold and dry complexion, and one frequently finds both black or dark/dusky and pallor together in descriptions of such a complexion.

with certain physical characteristics: a "Jewish" facial appearance specified by a dark but pallid complexion. Evidently these "Jewish" moral and physical characteristics could not be completely washed away even by Christian baptism.

Interestingly, in his defense of Innocent II Arnulf appeals not only to his moral character, which he regards as clearly superior to that of his rival, but also to his physical appearance. He exhorts Gerard to compare the features of Innocent II and Anaclet II, remarking:

If his [Innocent's] race is investigated, reckoned from his birth, he will be observed to be a faithful Christian born from among faithful Christians; if [one investigates] the counsel of his parents in his education and instruction, [he will be observed to be] one that dwells in the house of the Lord all the days of his life (cf. Ps. 22.5; 26.6) and perceives the will of the Lord; if [one investigates] the quality of his person, to describe first his physical appearance, he is a man of modest stature, and neither does a rather short stature render [him] abject nor does enormous size render [him] monstrous. A robust simplicity appears in his eyes and his countenance, and a shyness, which indicates the chastity of his soul, appears on his face. That face is so resplendent with dignity that it imparts a certain reverence to anyone gazing upon him. Also, among the other gifts of its munificence, divine power has bestowed upon him a special grace so that all those that see him he reconciles with a gentle kindness and love for him that is borne from his appearance alone. Moreover, supernal bounty has inspired his eyes with something divine, that is, that is full of grace, worthy of veneration, that in general is considered congruent with honor. [His] voice is smooth, but not so much so that it is rendered too weak, and not so that it lacks an inclination to sweetness and the authority of strength. [He has] a constant liveliness upon his face, a frequent laugh during a discussion's digression, yet nonetheless an appearance so pleasing that it can only increase not lessen the dignity of [his] face and words. This attracts those gazing upon him all the more, since in him it seems to be the beginning of his eternal joy, whose first fruits I think that he received in his body.⁶⁶

⁶⁶ "Si genus eius, recensita nativitate, disquiritur, fidelis natus ex fidelibus advertetur; si parentum in ipsius educatione vel doctrina consilium, ut habitaret in domo Domini omnibus diebus vitae suae et videret voluntatem Domini; si personae qualitas, ut prius habitudo corporea describatur, vir statura mediocris, quae nec abiectum brevitas nec immanem reddit immensae quantitatis excessus. Apparet in oculis eius et vultu robusta simplicitas, et quae castitatem animi probet, verecundia faciei. Quae profecto facies tanta dignitate resplendet, ut et ipsi quandam reverentiam ingerat intuenti. Ei quoque hanc inter cetera munificentiae suae dona specialem gratiam vis divina largita est, ut omnes se videntes mansueta sibi benignitate conciliet et dilectionem solo nanciscatur aspectu. Ipsius etenim oculis divinum quiddam superna bonitas inspiravit, quod plenum gratiae, quod reverentia dignum, quod honori congruum generaliter arbitretur. Vox blanda, sed non in nimiam tamen resoluta molliciem, ut et suavitatis favor et magnitudinis non desit

In contrast to Anaclet in whose flesh the first fruits of native error appeared, in Innocent's body, born from faithful Christian parents, there appear the first fruits of eternal joy. He is neither too short nor too tall. His eyes are portals to a chaste soul. His voice is pleasing but not lacking authority. His face is lively and given to laughter or humor, yet at the same time his is a dignified appearance. He is not physically deformed, like Gratian, Anaclet's brother, nor dark like a Jew or a Saracen.

This papal schism ended when Anaclet II died in Rome in 1138. Outside his *Invictiva in Girardum Engolismensem episcopum*, Arnulf seems not to mention Anaclet again, although he referred to him obliquely in a letter addressed to Pope Alexander III in 1159 at a time when he faced the anti-Pope Victor IV. There Arnulf encourages Alexander III by recalling the strength of Innocent II, who opposed that "heretic [Anaclet II] who exalted in the nobility of his birth, the accumulation of riches, his sinful rhetoric, his knowledge of the world, and even his popularity among worldly men."⁶⁷ Strangely, he makes no more mention of Anaclet's Jewish heritage.

According to Orderic Vitalis, Anaclet's body was hidden in Rome by his brothers, so that no one knows where he is buried.⁶⁸ Later traditions expand on the nature of his death. One is found in the *exempla* of the thirteenth-century Dominican, Stephen of Bourbon (d. 1261). Stephen composed his seven-part book of *exempla* to benefit preachers like himself, drawing upon classical authors, the Church Fathers, and upon contemporary events. According to Stephen's narrative, at the time of the schism Bernard of Clairvaux went to Italy to try to restore unity to the Church. A certain holy man, who was ill and near death, begged Bernard to visit him so that he could leave this world strengthened by Bernard's prayers. Since Bernard could not come to him due to the urgent negotiations to resolve the papal schism, he told the holy man that if he wanted to leave this world with more confidence, he should pray and petition the Blessed Virgin to bring the schism to an end.

auctoritas. Continua vultus alacritas, risus in sermonis excursu sepissimus, tanta tamen habitus honestate, ut verborum vultusque possit augere, non minuere dignitatem. Quod quidem eo magis allicit intuentes, quoniam id in ipso quoddam illius eternae iocunditatis videtur initium, cuius eum in ipso corpore quasdam existimo primitias accepisse." *Invictiva in Girardum Engolismensem episcopum*, 4, 96.

⁶⁷ *The Letter Collections of Arnulf of Lisieux*, 1.19, trans. Carolyn Poling Schriber, 50 (corresponds to Epist. 24 in Barlow's *The Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux*, 31).

⁶⁸ *The Ecclesiastical History of Oderic Vitalis*, 13.35, VI, 508.

Once he had done this, it seemed to the other holy man [to whom Bernard wrote] that a council was gathered in a great church, and there placed in the middle was a high throne. Seated on thrones too were abbots, cardinals, archbishops, bishops, and many other magnates, and on the high throne was Petrus Leonis, called Pope Anaclet. A certain very beautiful lady appeared there, before whom there appeared an elderly man, cloaked from behind with a sack, and he leaned his staff on one of the columns of the church. The aforementioned lady said to him: "Why have you come so late, elder lord?" And, descending from the altar, she took the staff of the elder man and, spinning it around, she struck the throat of Petrus Leonis with its point, saying "Why have you presumed to sit on the chair [or: in the See] that my son granted to the apostle Peter and to his canonically elected successors?" Having said this, the vision disappeared. Petrus Leonis, however, died from a swelling in the throat, and peace was restored to a church that was united once again.⁶⁹

The tale is clearly meant to demonstrate that divine judgment, using the Virgin as its instrument, took Anaclet's life. The real mystery here is: who is the elderly man carrying a staff and a sack? It is very tempting to see in this pilgrim the already well-known figure of Cartaphilus, a servant of Pontius Pilate who was later baptized with the name Joseph, who became the prototype for the wandering Jew.⁷⁰ If this is the case, then Mary uses the staff of the one who, according to legend, had struck and mocked Jesus before the crucifixion, for which he is punished to wander the earth ceaselessly until the Second Coming. Perhaps the staff pointing at Anaclet's throat is intended to identify him as a Jew who has mocked or insulted Jesus by occupying the See of Peter.

One wonders just how long the Pierleoni could be expected to display these so-called Jewish characteristics. Were they perceived truly as racial

⁶⁹ "Quo de facto, cuidam alteri visum est sancto quod in quadam magna ecclesia congregabatur concilium, et in medio collocabatur cathedra excelsa, et in sedilibus sedebant cardinales, abbates, archepiscopi, episcopi et multitudo aliorum magnorum, et in magna cathedra Petrus Leonis, papa Anacletus dictus. Venit ibi quedam domina speciosissima, ante quam venit quidam senior indutus sacco postremus, et cambuscam [reading cambuca for cambusca] suam ad columpnam ecclesie appodiavit. Cui dixit dicta domina: "Cur ita tarde venisti, domine senior?" Et de altari descendens, accepit cambuscam dicti senioris; et girans eam, percussit cuspide ejus guttur dicti Petri Leonis, dicens: 'Cur sedere presumpsisti in sede quam filius meus concessit Petro apostolo et successoribus electis canonice?' Et hoc dicto, visio disparuit. Petrus autem Leonis, gutture inflato, mortuus est, et Ecclesia in unum redacta, pace sibi reddita." Etienne de Bourbon, *Anecdotes Historiques, Légendes et Apologues tirés du recueil inédit d'Etienne de Bourbon*, 2.6, no. 138, ed. A. Lecoy de la Marche (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1877), 118–19.

⁷⁰ The story of Cartaphilus, later baptized with the name Joseph, and condemned to wander the earth until the Second Coming, can be found under the year 1228 A.D. in Roger of Wendover's *Flowers of History*, trans. J.A. Giles, 2 vols (Felinbach: Llanerch, 1994), II.2, 513.

characteristics that would endure forever because they somehow expressed an essential nature? Or, were they perceived to be a divine punishment, to endure “unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me,”⁷¹ much as conversos in Spain later would have to demonstrate an absence of Jewish blood going back four generations? Moreover, why did these become problematic traits only when Anaclet II ascended the throne of St. Peter? We have numerous examples of other Jewish converts in high episcopal office.⁷² Was it simply the case that, because Innocent II’s election was the more irregular, that support for Anaclet II could be undermined only by associating him with the Jews and Antichrist? Or was this negative campaign somehow a reflection of new fears in twelfth century such that, as Bernard of Clairvaux insisted, “it is an insult to Christ that the offspring of a Jew has occupied the chair of Peter”?

Why were physical attributes added to moral flaws as distinguishing Jewish features? Certainly, the later Jewish medieval myth that a convert to Christianity who was in reality a crypto-Jew would obtain the papal throne expressed potent, quasi-messianic longings in a medieval Jewish world yearning for deliverance.⁷³ Nonetheless, the fears expressed at Anaclet’s election of a Jewish conspiracy to steal the papacy seem to precede, not to follow, Christian awareness of this Jewish messianic tradition. What, then, elicited this anti-Jewish campaign against Anaclet II?

The Dark-Complexioned Jew

We cannot answer all of these questions. We can propose, however, that Arnulf’s invective assumes that there are enduring Jewish moral and physical traits that persist beyond baptism. Curiously, perhaps the most persuasive evidence to confirm that in the twelfth and thirteenth century Christians had begun to identify Jews in this way will be found in Jewish sources. The famous Jewish biblical exegete Rashi (d. 1105) understood the image of the suffering servant in Isaiah 53 to refer to the people of

⁷¹ Ex. 20.5; Ex. 34.7; Num. 14.18; Deut. 5.9.

⁷² Both Pablo of Santo María and his son, Alonso, became Archbishop of Burgos, and they are not isolated examples. Other converts occupied high positions in the papal court. One example from early fifteenth-century Spain is Pablo of Santa María’s friend Joshua Halorque (or ha-Lorki), the pope’s physician, who as a Christian convert took the name Jerónimo de Santa Fe and became the architect of the Tortosa disputation (1413–1414).

⁷³ For the early modern workings of the myth, see Joseph Sherman, *The Jewish Pope: Myth, Diaspora and Yiddish Literature*, Studies in Yiddish 4 (Oxford: European Humanities Center, 2003). As Sherman notes, however, the seventeenth-century Yiddish versions that form his subject are based on older, Hebrew materials.

Israel, the Jews, who suffer in exile for the sins of the other nations. The more abject Israel's debasement, the greater will be the nations' eventual astonishment and recognition of their own sin. One sign of this debasement is a claim that Rashi willingly embraces, viz. that the "[Jews'] form is darker than that of other men, as we see with our own eyes."⁷⁴ Their darker complexion is viewed as a consequent of exile and therefore several decades before the election of Anaclet II, Rashi had already assimilated a view that Jews are darker in complexion than others, although he invested this with a positive theological significance. In the thirteenth century, we find another example from the *Nizzahon Vetus* or *Old Book of Polemic*, an encyclopedic collection of anti-Christian arguments employed by Franco-German Jews. In this collection one encounters the following argument that reflects upon our inquiry into perceptions of a Jewish complexion:

The heretics ask: Why are most Gentiles fair-skinned and handsome while most Jews are dark and ugly? Answer them that this is similar to a fruit: when it begins to grow it is white but when it ripens it becomes black, as is the case with sloes and plums. On the other hand, any fruit which is red at the beginning becomes lighter as it ripens, as is the case with apples and apricots. This, then, is testimony that Jews are pure of menstrual blood so that there is no initial redness. Gentiles, however, are not careful about menstruant women and have sexual relations during menstruation; thus, there is redness at the outset, and so the fruit that comes out, i.e., the children, are light. One can respond further by noting that Gentiles are incontinent and have sexual relations during the day, at a time when they see the faces on attractive pictures; therefore, they give birth to children who look like those pictures, as it is written, And the sheep conceived when they came to drink before the rods.⁷⁵ [Gen. 30.38–39]

This rich narrative responds to a question posed by a "heretic," i.e., an apostate Jew, concerning the skin color of Jews and Gentiles. "Gentiles," he alleges, are "fair-skinned and handsome while most Jews are dark and ugly." Why should this be the case? Note that the Jewish respondent does not challenge the premise, but only tries to interpret the allegation in a way that is favorable to Jews. His reply avows that there are certain fruits whose flesh is white when they are immature, but which darkens as

⁷⁴ *Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah According to the Jewish Interpreters*, trans S.R. Driver and A.D. Neubauer, 2 vols. (New York: KTAV, 1969), 1:37 (Hebrew), 2:37 (English), according to the translation in Alexandra Cuffel, *Gendering Disgust in Medieval Religious Polemic* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007), 189.

⁷⁵ *The Jewish-Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages: A critical edition of the Nizzahon vetus*, cap. 238, ed. David Berger (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1979), 224.

they ripen. These fruits represent the Jews, who, mature in their faith and religious customs, were “white” in some sense at the outset but gradually became darker, like ripe fruit. In contrast, Gentiles are compared to those fruits whose flesh is reddish when still immature, and which grows whiter as they ripen. Their subsequent whiteness is interpreted as a pejorative sign that reveals a deeper truth about sexual conduct. Because Jews avoid sexual relations with a menstruant, in them “there is no initial redness,” whereas Gentiles “are not careful about menstruant women and have sexual relations.” Since their children take their origin from impure blood, they are tainted with a redness that gradually whitens, leaving them “fair-skinned.” Consequently, Gentiles may appear fair-skinned and handsome, while Jews are “dark and ugly,” but their appearances mask a deeper truth: that Jews are faithful to God’s law, and Gentiles are not.

In another Jewish polemical text entitled *Sefer ha-Nizzahon*, likely written in Prague about 1400 by Rabbi Yom-Tov Lipmann Mühlhausen, the author responds to Christian claims that Jews are dark and ugly in appearance because they have rejected God. Once again, Mühlhausen does not deny that Jews may be dark-complexioned and ugly now, but instead he insists that Jews will experience an extreme makeover when “in the messianic age we will all be better looking than anybody else.”⁷⁶ This transformation, postponed to the messianic age, presupposes that a change in external appearance will faithfully reflect a change in Israel’s internal moral and religious condition that helps to precipitate the appearance of the messiah.

In sum, then, we have conflicting but sufficient evidence, I think, to conclude that there was some strong sense among both Jews and Christians from as early as the twelfth century that Jews either *were* physically different or that they *ought* to be so because of their different faith and customs. Christian polemics stigmatized even Christians that were several generations removed from Jewish roots with claims that a dark and ugly Jewish complexion was still visible on their countenances, while Jewish sources from as early as the twelfth century easily accepted such portraits, but interpreted them in a manner favorable to Jews and unfavorable to Christians. Such conflicting use of physical imagery continued well into the modern era and was employed in the early sixteenth century by the

⁷⁶ *Sefer ha-Nizzahon*, par. 239, quoted by Ora Limor and Israel Jacob Yuval, in “Skepticism and Conversion: Jews, Christians, and Doubters in *Sefer ha-Nizzahon*,” in *Hebraica Veritas: Christian Hebraists and the Study of Judaism in Early Modern Europe*, eds. Allison P. Coudert and Jeffrey S. Shoulson (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 169.

radical Protestant reformer, Sebastian Münster (d. 1552), in a short Latin and Hebrew dialogue with a Jew that he composed as a conversionary tract.⁷⁷ In the dialogue, a Christian meets a Jew on the road and greets him in Hebrew. When the Jew asked how he knew him to be a Jew, the Christian replied "I knew that you are a Jew from the appearance of your face. So indeed you Jews have a certain peculiar facial appearance, different in form and shape from the rest of mortals, which fact has often led me to wonder. In fact you are black and ugly, and barely white at all in the manner of other men."⁷⁸ The Jew responds, "It is surprising, if we are ugly, why do you Christians desire our women so much; they must appear to be more beautiful than yours."⁷⁹ Surprisingly, Münster admits that Jewish *women* are quite desirable, but the admission only serves to emphasize the monstrousness of ugly, deformed Jewish men having intercourse with them.

It is therefore clear that physical imagery played a significant role in polemics between Jews and Christians. From at least the early twelfth century, Christians derided the Jews and even some converts from Judaism as dark-complexioned, ugly, and deformed, and these characteristics were understood to be external signs of a spiritual depravity. For their part, Jews, a weak minority in Christendom, assimilated such depictions, but attempted to impose a different valuation on them. If Jews are dark-complexioned, it is a function of their redemptive role as the suffering servant, or because they faithfully observe the Mosaic Law and do not have intercourse with menstruants, but in the messianic age a shining beauty will be restored to them. Did they *really* look different from Christians? We cannot provide a conclusive proof here, but my sense is that the attribution of physical difference satisfied a felt need that Jews *should look different* from their Christian neighbors, and empirical reality was constructed to reflect this theological necessity.

⁷⁷ *Messias Christianorum et Iudeorum. Hebraice et Latine* (Basel: Heinrich Petrus, 1539).

⁷⁸ *Messias* sig. A5v: "Christianus [...] ex forma autem facie tue cognovi te esse Iudeum. Si quidem est vobis Iudeis peculiaris quaedam faciei imago diversa a reliquorum mortaliū forma a [et?] figura, quae res saepe in admirationem me duxit. Estis enim vos nigri et deformes, et minime albicantes more reliquorum hominum." Cited in Ronnie Po-chia Hsia, "Witchcraft, Magic, and the Jews in Germany," in *From Witness to Witchcraft: Jews and Judaism in Medieval Christian Thought*, ed. Jeremy Cohen, Wolfenbütteler Mittelalter-Studien, 11 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1996), 428 (428, n. 32).

⁷⁹ "Iudeus: Mirum est, si deformes sumus, cur vos Christiani adeo amatis mulieres nostras, illaque pulchriores vobis vestris appareant." *Messias* sig. A5v, Cited in Ronnie Po-chia Hsia, "Witchcraft, Magic, and the Jews in Germany," 428, n. 33.